REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **January 10, 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, and 23-48. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, and 23-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty et al. (USPN 6,275,824, hereinafter "O'Flaherty") in view of Sweet et al (USPub 2002/0031230, hereinafter "Sweet").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, and 41 were rejected as being unpatentable over O'Flaherty in view of Sweet. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of O'Flaherty and Sweet teaches restricting access to sensitive data (see O'Flaherty Abstract; column 2, line 53 to column 3, line 21) wherein a **security officer and/or domain authorities can perform administrative tasks** (see Sweet [0090]-[0091]; [0092]-[0102]). The only difference between the security officer and the domain authority is that the security officer *initially creates the domain authorities and initializes domain parameters* (see Sweet [0090]-[0091]). Either type of administrator can perform administrative tasks on the sensitive data (the domain in Sweet).

In contrast, the present invention manages access to sensitive objects in a database (see page 7, lines 3-11; page 8, lines 9-20; FIG. 3 of the instant application) **wherein an administrator in the plurality of administrators who is not a security officer cannot perform administrative functions on sensitive objects** (see page 7, lines 7-11; page 8, lines 9-20). Hence, the present invention provides a two-level system that enables only a security officer to perform administration function on sensitive objects, and allows normal database administrators to perform administrative functions on non-sensitive objects, but not on sensitive objects.

There is nothing within O'Flaherty or Sweet, either separately or in concert, that suggests managing access to sensitive objects in a database wherein an

17

administrator in the plurality of administrators who is not a security officer cannot perform administrative functions on sensitive objects.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, and 41 to clarify that the present invention manages access to sensitive objects in a database *wherein an administrator in the plurality of administrators who is not a security officer cannot perform administrative functions on sensitive objects*. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 3-11; page 8, lines 9-20; and FIG. 3 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, and 41 as presented are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-5 and 7-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-13 and 15-16, which depend upon claim 9, claims 18-21 and 23-24, which depend upon claim 17, claims 26-32, which depend upon claim 25, claims 34-40, which depend upon claim 33, and claims 42-48, which depend upon claim 41, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   _[signature]_

A. Richard Park
Registration No. 41,241

Date: February 8, 2005

A. Richard Park
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1661
FAX: (530) 759-1665

19